Reply to Office Action Dated: September 2, 2003

REMARKS

Applicants wish to thank Examiner Eashoo for indicating allowability of Claims 32, 40 and 41 if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.

Applicants have added new Claims 42-44 which include the allowable subject matter of Claims 32, 40 and 41. Thus, new Claims 42-44 should be allowed.

The present invention as set forth in **Claim 1** relates to a process for the fashioning of a portion of a profiled bead extruded along an intended path onto an object, in which process an initially shapeless mass of material is produced in the portion and is given a desired final shape by contact with a shaped surface of a moving tool, with any excess material being automatically expelled from the tool in order to be removed, the improvement wherein the mass of material is produced by the superposition of two segments of the extruded strip, with the steps of:

guiding an extrusion die along a first segment of the intended path of a profiled bead, including the portion to be fashioned;

moving the die away from the object and, relative to the object, to an adjacent position of the portion to be fashioned; and

guiding the die along a second segment of the path of the profiled bead, also including the portion to be fashioned.

The present invention as set forth in **Claim 20** relates to a process for using a tool to fashion extrudate on a pane comprising:

applying extrudate along a first segment of the pane;

applying extrudate along a second segment of the pane, with the second segment extruded on at least a portion of the first segment and the extrudate forming a superposed region defined by contact between the segments;

Reply to Office Action Dated: September 2, 2003

allowing a shaped surface of the tool to contact and fashion the superposed region.

The advantages of the present invention are discussed at page 4, lines 19-39 of the specification:

The process according to the invention is characterized by the fact that material needed for the final fashioning is supplied directly at the time of extrusion, so that after the die has left the region in question, the touch-up operation can be started at the same time as the extrusion stops.

The saving in production time represents a certain economical advantage.

Furthermore, since the touch-up operation is started immediately, and difference in appearance between the region which is extruded in the usual manner and the region which has undergone the additional treatment is lessened, since the material of the extruded part has not yet been cured and/or crosslinked significantly by the time the fashioning of the adjacent part is started.

This process is particularly useful for the local production of particular shapes in limited regions of the strip, in particular for corner regions which are more difficult to produce the more acute-angled the corner.

Walter (DE 43 26 179 A1) fail to disclose or suggest a process as claimed having the above discussed advantages.

Applicants note that the International Search Report lists DE 43 26 179A merely as a category "A" document, relating merely to the technical background of the invention.

In addition, a process wherein the extrudable material continues to be delivered by the die while the latter is being moved as claimed in **Claim 5** is not disclosed or suggested. Due to the sharp ends of the two beads 22 and 23 in Fig. 2 it is suggested in the reference that delivery of the material is stopped while turning the extrusion nozzle. Accordingly, Claim 5 should be allowable.

Therefore, the rejection of Claims 1-6, 7 and 33, Claims 20-25 and 27-31 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as anticipated by Walter and the rejection of Claim 6 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) over Walter (DE 43 26 179 A1) are believed to be unsustainable as the present

Reply to Office Action Dated: September 2, 2003

invention is neither anticipated nor obvious and withdrawal of this rejection is respectfully requested.

The rejection of Claims 35-37 and 39 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) over <u>Walter</u> (DE 43 26 179 A1) in view of <u>Kunert et al</u> (US 5,057,265) is respectfully traversed.

The present invention as set forth in Claim 35 relates to a process for working a portion (3) of a profiled strand (2) extruded on a window (1), in which an initially shapeless material mass (4) is produced in the portion (3) by superimposing two extruded profile segments (2a, 2b) and is shaped to a desired final shape by contact with a shaped surface of a mobile tool (5), with any excess material being automatically forced back out of the tool for removal, wherein the mobile tool (5) is applied to the portion (3) to be worked just after the extrusion die (D) has left the area of the second segment (2b) including said portion, in an extrusion station (E), without displacement, transfer or repositioning of the window (1).

As acknowledged by the Examiner, <u>Walter</u> is silent about moving a window with extruded profile thereon to a location where the pressing tool is located. In addition, <u>Walter</u> fails to disclose or suggest that the overlap portions are shapeless. <u>Kunert et al</u> (US 5,057,265) fails to cure the defects of the primary reference as they also fail to disclose or suggest a process as claimed.

Therefore, the rejection of Claims 35-37 and 39 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) over Walter in view of Kunert et al (US 5,057,265) is believed to be unsustainable as the present invention is neither anticipated nor obvious and withdrawal of this rejection is respectfully requested.

This application presents allowable subject matter, and the Examiner is kindly requested to pass it to issue. Should the Examiner have any questions regarding the claims or otherwise wish to discuss this case, he is kindly invited to contact Applicants' below-signed

Reply to Office Action Dated: September 2, 2003

representative, who would be happy to provide any assistance deemed necessary in speeding this application to allowance.

Respectfully submitted,

OBLON, SPIVAK, McCLELLAND, MAIER & NEUSTADT, P.C.

 $\begin{array}{c} \text{Customer Number} \\ 22850 \end{array}$

Tel: (703) 413-3000 Fax: (703) 413 -2220

NFO:KAG:

Jean-Paul Laval eye Attorney of Record Registration No.: 31,451

Kirsten A. Grueneberg, Ph.D. Registration No.: 47,297